## GRONEK & LATHAM, LLP

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

4552

DEBORAH B. ANSBRO DAVID P. BARKER MICHAEL J. BEAUDINE BRIAN W. BENNETT JOSEPH G. COLOMBO DANIEL H. COULTOFF ARISTIDES "KICO" J. DIAZ

CHRISTOPHER K. KAY OF COUNSEL

MARIANE L. DORRIS

390 NORTH ORANGE AVENUE, SUITE 600 ORLANDO, FLORIDA 32801 POST OFFICE BOX 3353 ORLANDO, FLORIDA 32802

TELEPHONE: (407) 481-5800 FACSIMILE: (407) 481-5801

\*\*NO NOV 17 A 8 .56

MICHAEL J. FURBUSH
ROBERT J. GRONEK
PETER G. LATHAM
K. RODNEY MAY
GREGORY W. MEIER
PAUL L. SANGIOVANNI
R. SCOTT SHUKER
KAREN K. WARD

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL: (407) 481-5830

November 17, 2000

Dockets Management Branch HFA - 305 Food and Drug Administration Room 1061 5630 Fishers Lane Rockville, MD 20852

Re: DOCKET NO. 00N-1351: FOOD LABELING; USE OF THE TERM "FRESH" FOR FOODS PROCESSED WITH ALTERNATIVE NON-THERMAL TECHNOLOGIES

Dear Sir(s) and Madam(s):

This letter is submitted to you on behalf of our client, Citrus World, Inc., and supplements their response dated August 22, 2000. Citrus World, Inc. produces citrus and other fruit juices and drinks. As a cooperative, Citrus World, Inc. represents over one thousand citrus growers owning over 60,000 acres of citrus groves in the state of Florida. As detailed below, Citrus World, Inc. does not believe the use of the term "fresh" should be permitted in conjunction with juice subjected to the Alternative Non-Thermal Technologies.

## 1. Consumer Perception of the term "Fresh" and the definition under Section 21 C.F.R. §101.95.

Prior to 1993, FDA enforced labeling claims such as the use of the term "Fresh" or other claims under the general prohibition of "misbranding" or "mislabeling" without clarification by specific regulation. After increased use of the term on a number of food products resulted in increased consumer confusion, the FDA developed the current regulations, namely 21 C.F.R. §101.95. The FDA in 1993 concluded that because of the likelihood to mislead consumers the word "fresh" should not be used to imply a food product is "unprocessed" when, in fact, it has been processed. Citrus World, Inc.'s experience in the market and consumer group responses indicate

00N-1351

C 46

Dockets Management Branch November 17, 2000 Page 2

the process of "codifying" and enforcing this definition has strengthened consumer's reliance on the use of the term "fresh". We believe the result has created greater certainty in consumers' minds and greater value to the industry for the use of the term "fresh". It is also worth emphasizing that the definition ascribed to "fresh" through this process is based in large part upon consumer perception. In fact, consumer perception was referenced in the 1993 findings to validate revising the proposed definition and the phrase "in a manner that suggests or implies..." in §101.95(a) embodies consumer perception into the heart of the definition. It is also worth noting that most of the exceptions in §101.95(c) are also founded upon significant consumer awareness (e.g., milk, wax coating, etc.).

In addition to the clarity afforded by the existing definition of "fresh", the term has unique application to juices. Specifically, when applied to juices, "fresh" assumes fresh fruit is mechanically expressed in a similar manner as consumers could obtain if extracted at home on a kitchen appliance. Thus, the term means not only that the fruit was fresh but the process is simple extraction. We believe consumers rely upon "fresh" as applied to juice to mean much more than "organo-leptic characteristics". The exception in §101.95(c) afford no support for applying the term "fresh" to Alternative Non-Thermal Technologies applied to juice. The ability to utilize home extraction affords consumers a readily available means of supply and comparison. For example, in the case of citrus juice, it is estimated that more than five hundred million oranges are consumed annually as "at home" expressed juice in the United States. The FDA found in 1993 "The definition ["Fresh"] has particular applicability where there are processed and unprocessed forms of the food available."

Thus, we believe consumer perception should be the primary basis in analyzing Alternative Non-Thermal Technologies in the context of the use of the word "fresh". We believe consumers are generally unaware and uninformed of Alternative Non-Thermal Technologies and the effects of these processes. While technological advancement should be encouraged, it should not be promoted at the expense of the consumer's trust and reliance upon the FDA and its regulations, especially where the trust is founded upon a consumer based definition.

## 2. Are Alternative Non-thermal Technologies truly non-thermal?

All indications are that a "shelf life extension" is achieved by processing fruit with Alternative Non-Thermal Technologies and we believe this will be seen as a "form of preservation". This is especially true given the fact that the Institute of Food Technologies (IFT) final report entitled "Kinetics of Microbial Inactivation for Alternative Food Processing Technologies" indicates that the temperature of the juice does rise when certain "non-thermal" processes are applied and that other significant questions concerning the effects of Alternative Non-Thermal Technologies require further research. Based upon the knowledge today, Alternative Non-Thermal Technologies processes are likely perceived as much closer to the modern "flash pasteurization" and would not be perceived as closer to "unprocessed". In fact,

Dockets Management Branch November 17, 2000 Page 3

many of the attributes claimed for Alternative Non-Thermal Technologies are capable of duplication with modern pasteurization.

## 3. What best describes alternative process.

As mentioned herein, we believe consumer perception would support some description of the processes described as "Alternative Non-Thermal Technologies" but would **not** permit the use of "fresh" or otherwise imply juices subjected to Alternative Non-Thermal Technologies are "fresh squeezed". One alternative to that is to utilize the term of "pasteurized" for the Alternative Non-Thermal Technologies (provided the research ultimately establishes the alternative process to have adequate safety enhancing effects on the juice). Our research indicates pasteurization is generally understood by consumers to involve a limited process primarily for health/safety benefits. Utilizing the term "pasteurized" could afford Alternative Non-Thermal Technologies a method of describing their product that is consistent with consumer perception. Those utilizing an Alternative Non-Thermal Technology described with the qualifier "pasteurized" can inform consumers of any perceived "enhancement" to the extent permissible under FDA regulations and existing laws.

Sincerely,

Peter G. Latham

PGL:bs

cc: Dr. Robert C. Behr

Mr. Kevin Gaffney

Mr. Stephen M. Caruso

Date 1 FedEx Tracking Number	
Date   FedEx Tracking Number   FedEx Tracking Number   FedEx Standard Overnight   Sender's   FedEx Priority Overnight   FedEx Standard Overnight   Next business norming   FedEx Standard Overnight   Next business norming   FedEx Express Saver*   Second owness day   FedEx Express Saver*   FedEx 2Day*   FedEx Express Saver*   Second owness day   FedEx Day*   FedEx Express Saver*   Second owness day   FedEx Day*   FedEx Day*   FedEx Day*   Second owness day   FedEx Day*   FedEx Day*   FedEx Day*   Second owness day   FedEx Day*   FedEx Day*   FedEx Day*   Second owness day   FedEx Day*   FedEx Day*   FedEx Day*   Second owness day   FedEx Day*   FedEx Day*   FedEx Day*   Second owness day   FedEx Day*   FedEx Day*   FedEx Day*   Second owness day   FedEx Day*   FedEx Day*   FedEx Day*   Second owness day   FedEx Day*   FedEx Day*   FedEx Day*   Second owness day   FedEx Day*   Fed	The state of the s
Company KAY GRONEK & LATHAM  Company KAY GRONEK & LATHAM  Address 390 N DRANGE AVE STE 600  Dept/Reco/Sulta/Room  City DRLANDO  State FL ZIP 32801  Third business day  Third business day	Packages up to 150 lbs.  ary commitment may be later in some areas.  FedEx First Overnight Earliest next business morning delivery to select locations
Company KAY GRONEK & LATHAM  Address 390 N DRANGE AVE STE 600  Dept./floor/SulfuyRoom  City DRLANDO  State FL ZIP 32801  Address Preight Service  FedEx 1Day Freight Second business day  *Cell for Confirmation:  5 Packaging  DefedEx Letter*  FedEx Pak*	"FedEx Letter Rate not available Minimum charge. One-pound rate
2 V 100 DC	Packages over 150 lbs. ery commitment may be later in some areas.
2 V 100 DC	FedEx 3Day Freight Third business day
2 Your Internal Billing Reference	* Declared value limit \$500  Other Pkg. Includes FedEx Box, FedEx Tube, and customer pkg.
2 Your Internal Billing Reference 6 Special Handling Sunday Delivery HOLD Week	
3 To Recipient OCKCLS Management Profes North Same Saturday Delivery Assistate for Fedex Priority Openingt and Fedex Davy to select ZIP codes Saturday Delivery Openingt and Fedex Davy to select ZIP codes Saturday Delivery Openingt to select ZIP codes Saturday	ation at FedEx Location
Company HPA . 305 Food and Drug Does this shipment contain desigerous goods?  Due to a must be checked:  No Yes Yes Supports Declaration on Company Declaration of Company Declaration	Ce , s, UN 1845 xkg
Dangerous Goods cannot be shipped in Fedits peckaging	Cargo Aircraft Only Obtain Recip.
We cannot deliver to PD. boxes or PD. ZIP codes.    Dept/Floor/Suita/Room	edit Card Cash/Check
To HOLD' at FedSx locetion print FedSx eddress here.  City CC X 1 1 1 C State M ZIP 20652  Total Packages Total Weight 21 Total Packages Total Weight	Total Charges
1 0ur fiebility is limited to \$100 unless you declare a higher value. See the FedEx Service I	Guide for details.
8 Release Signature sign to authorize delivery without obtaining signature.	
By signing van arthrorize us to deliver this shipment without obtaining a signed and signed are some properties of the p	359